

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

## PCT

### INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 200310853-2	<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b>		See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/EP2004/051939	International filing date ( <i>day/month/year</i> ) 27 August 2004 (27.08.2004)	Priority date ( <i>day/month/year</i> ) 10 September 2003 (10.09.2003)	
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237			
Applicant HEWLETT-PACKARD DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, L.P.			

1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).

2. This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet.

In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

- |                                     |              |   |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I    | Basis of the report   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II   | Priority  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Box No. III  | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Box No. IV   | Lack of unity of invention  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V    | Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Box No. VI   | Certain documents cited   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Box No. VII  | Certain defects in the international application  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application   |

4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).

		Date of issuance of this report 13 March 2006 (13.03.2006)
The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland  Facsimile No. +41 22 740 14 35	Authorized officer  Agnes Wittmann-Regis  Telephone No. +41 22 338 89 70	

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

17/3

REC'D 08 MAR 2005

WIPO

PCT

PCT

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
see form PCT/ISA/220

### FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
PCT/EP2004/051939

International filing date (day/month/year)  
27.08.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)  
10.09.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
G06F3/033

Applicant  
HEWLETT-PACKARD DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, L.P.

#### 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- Box No. II Priority
- Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- Box No. VIII Certain observations on the International application

#### 2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

#### 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - Glitschiner Str. 103  
D-10958 Berlin  
Tel. +49 30 25901 - 0  
Fax: +49 30 25901 - 840

Authorized Officer

Kirsten, K

Telephone No. +49 30 25901-424



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/EP2004/051939

**Box No. I Basis of the opinion**

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
  - This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:
    - a sequence listing
    - table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:
    - in written format
    - in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:
    - contained in the international application as filed.
    - filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
    - furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3.  In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/EP2004/051939

**Box No. II Priority**

1.  The following document has not been furnished:

- copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).  
 translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2.  This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3.  It has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the priority document was not available to the ISA at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1). This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.
4. Additional observations, if necessary:

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or  
industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	3-7,9-13
	No: Claims	1,2,8,14,15
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-15
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-15
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

**see separate sheet**

**Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application**

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

**see separate sheet**

**Re Item V.**

1. The following document is referred to in this communication:  
D1 : US 5 317 733  
D2: WO 02/19260
2. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1,14 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.  
Document D1 discloses:  
A document (form) to be printed with functional areas containing containing pattern; the pattern is filled into this area (see e.g. column 25, line 68 - column 26, line 42; figure 31, 37) after the document is modified, and then printing this document.
3. The present application does not meet the requirements of the PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 9 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.  
As D1 shows the features described in point 2, the only feature described in claim 9 that is not disclosed in D1, is the usage of a print application to perform the allocation of a pattern to a certain area of the document.  
To use a print application for additional tasks beside only specifically printer-related matters must be seen as an obvious alternative for the person skilled in the field. The skilled person would, for example, use this method if the company sold printing equipment (including printer-related software) and would like to add the extra functionality of pattern-filling of certain areas in documents. This reorganisation of software tasks cannot be seen to involve any inventive activity for the person skilled in the field.
4. The dependent claims do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step for the following reasons:  
The subject-matter of dependent claims 2,8,10,11,15 is shown in D1.  
The subject-matter of dependent claims 3,4 is not inventive for the same reasons as pointed out in point 3 regarding claim 9.  
The subject-matter of dependent claims 5-7,12,13 is known from D2, and it would not

involve any inventive activity for the person skilled in the field to use this technology in the system described in D1.

**Re Item VIII.**

1. Although claims 9,14 have been drafted as separate independent claims, they appear to relate effectively to the same subject-matter and to differ from each other only with regard to the definition of the subject-matter for which protection is sought and/or in respect of the terminology used for the features of that subject-matter. The aforementioned claims therefore lack conciseness. Moreover, lack of clarity of the claims as a whole arises, since the plurality of independent claims makes it difficult, if not impossible, to determine the matter for which protection is sought, and places an undue burden on others seeking to establish the extent of the protection. Hence, the above mentioned claims do not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.
2. The expressions "functional area", "identity of the pattern", "pattern space" used in the claims are very vague and it cannot be understood by reading the claims alone what these expressions refer to.
3. In dependent claim 12 the expression "functional space" is used when probably the expressions "functional area" is intended.

\*\*\*\*\*